REMARKS

Claims 1-25 were pending in the Application. Claim 1 is an independent claim and claims 2-16 depend there from. Claim 17 is an independent claim and claims 18-23 depend there from. Claim 24 and 25 are independent claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) – Osborne (Claims 1-5, 10 and 16)

On pages 3-7 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Osborne (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,804). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

With regard to the anticipation rejections, MPEP 2131 states, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed.Cir. 1987). MPEP 2131 also states, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Regarding claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that Osborne fails to teach, suggest, or disclose, for example, "wherein a one-shot initiation process of an RDMA operation is performed between the driver and the NIC of the host, the one-shot initiation process comprising communicating a single command message comprising: buffer command information, and a write command to write a send command," as set forth in independent claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that Osborne's disclosure at Figures 1-2 and Column 7, Lines 14-45 teach the Applicant's claim limitations. (Office Action, Pages 3-4). Specifically, the Office Action alleges that Osborne's processor 54 is a driver, Osborne's net interface 84 is a

network interface card (NIC) and Osborne's disclosure at Figure 2 and Column 7, Lines 14-45 teaches a one-shot initiation process of an RDMA operation being performed between the driver and the NIC of the host. (Office Action, Pages 3-4). The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action mischaracterizes the Osborne reference and the Applicant's claims.

Specifically, the Applicant notes that Osborne's Figures 1-2 and its disclosure at Column 7, Lines 14-42 merely teach the operations between an application 58 and an operating system 56 in performing a conventional communication process in a computer system. (*See e.g.*, Osborne, Figures 1-2, Column 5, Lines 49-50, and Column 7, Lines 14-45). In other words, Osborne's disclosure regarding sending a send command **from an application 58 to operating system 56** is wholly unrelated to a one-shot initiation process of an RDMA operation being performed **between a driver and a NIC of a host**. Because the Office Action has failed to show "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" as required for an anticipation rejection under MPEP 2131, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) cannot be maintained.

Further, Osborne's disclosure at Column 7, Lines 14-45 is wholly unrelated to RDMA operations. As is well known in the art, RDMA operations do not involve copying message data from application memory 66 to operating system buffers 62 as taught by Osborne. Further, the Applicant notes that Osborne's disclosure regarding setting up **DMA at a receiver** is different than an **initiation process of an RDMA operation**. Because the Office Action has failed to show "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" as required for an anticipation rejection under MPEP 2131, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) cannot be maintained.

Therefore, for at least the above stated reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the Osborne reference fails to teach, suggest, or disclose Applicant's invention as set forth in claim 1. The Applicant believes that claim 1 is allowable over Osborne. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is an independent claim, and that claims 2-16 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. Because claims 2-16 depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-16 are allowable over the Osborne reference, as well. The

Applicant also submits that each of Applicant's claims 2-16 is independently allowable. The Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the rejection of claims 1-5, 10 and 16 under U.S.C. §102(b), be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Osborne and Roach (Claims 6-9, 11 and 24)

On pages 8-14 of the Office Action, independent claim 24 and dependent claims 6-9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborne in view of Roach et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,910, hereinafter "Roach"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a *prima facie* case of obviousness to be established, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Rev. 6, Sep. 2007 ("MPEP") states the following:

> The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007) noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit. The Federal Circuit has stated that "rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained with mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness."

See the MPEP at § 2142, citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d at 1396 (quoting Federal Circuit statement with approval). Further, MPEP § 2143.01 states that "the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art" (citing *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Additionally, if a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established, the Applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness:

> The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness. If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness.

See MPEP at § 2142.

Claims 6-9 and 11 depend either directly or indirectly from Applicant's independent claim 1. Applicant believes that claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination of references, in that Roach fails to overcome the deficiencies of Osborne, for at least the reasons set forth above. Because claims 6-9 and 11 depend from independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-9 and 11 are allowable over the proposed combination of Osborne and Roach, as well. The Applicant further submits that each of claims 6-9 and 11 is independently allowable. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Regarding Applicant's independent claim 24, the combination of Osborne and Roach at least fail to disclose, for example, "initiating an RDMA write operation using a one-shot initiation process between a driver and a NIC of a host, wherein the one-shot initiation process comprises communicating a single command message comprising: buffer command information comprising commands to insert and validate an STag value, and a write command to write an RDMA send message; inserting the STag value in a first field of a DDP or RDMA header of the RDMA send message; and validating the STag value in the first field with a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the DDP or RDMA header," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 24.

As discussed above with regard to Applicant's independent claim 1, nowhere in Osborne is there any disclosure regarding initiating an RDMA write operation using a one-shot initiation process between a driver and a NIC of a host. Specifically, the Office Action's citation to sections of Osborne that merely describe the operations between an application 58 and an operating system 56 in performing a conventional communication process in a computer system including Osborne's disclosure regarding sending a send command **from an application 58 to**

operating system 56 is wholly unrelated to a **one-shot initiation process of an RDMA operation** being performed **between a driver and a NIC of a host**. Roach fails to remedy the deficiencies of Osborne. Rather, Roach merely teaches placing information indicating which frame is the last frame in a series of frames being sent. (*See e.g.*, Roach, Abstract).

Further, the Office Action alleges that Osborne's disclosure of a receiver ID, source address and message size sent between an application 58 and operating system 56 teach a one-shot initiation process comprises communicating a single command message comprising buffer command information comprising commands to insert an STag value, and a write command to write an RDMA send message. (Office Action, Page 13). However, the Applicant notes that a receiver ID, source address and message size are not commands to insert an STag value. Rather, the receiver ID merely indicates where the message is to be sent while the source address and size merely indicate where the message data will be taken from and how much message data will be sent. (Osborne, Column 7, Lines 22-25). One of ordinary skill in the art would easily appreciate the differences between a source address and size, and a command to insert an STag value. Roach fails to remedy the deficiencies of Osborne. Rather, Roach merely teaches placing information indicating which frame is the last frame in a series of frames being sent. (*See e.g.*, Roach, Abstract).

Also, the Office Action alleges that Roach's Figures 8-9 remedy the deficiencies of Osborne by teaching a one-shot initiation process comprises communicating a single command message comprising buffer command information comprising commands to validate an STag value. (Office Action, Page 13). However, Roach's Figures 8-9 merely describe a Buffer Point List Format (Figure 9) and the Buffer Pointer List Entry Format (Figure 8) for the Buffer Point List that "must exist in contiguous physical memory." (Roach, Column 8, Lines 31-35). In other words, Roach is wholly unrelated to **a single command message** comprising **commands to validate an STag value** as alleged in the Office Action, and instead is related to buffer lists stored in physical memory.

Additionally, the Office Action alleges that Roach's Figures 8-9 remedy the deficiencies of Osborne by teaching "inserting the STag value in a first field of a DDP or RDMA header of

the RDMA send message; and validating the STag value in the first field with a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the DDP or RDMA header." (Office Action, Pages 13-14). However, as mentioned above, Roach's Figures 8-9 merely describe a Buffer Point List Format (Figure 9) and the Buffer Pointer List Entry Format (Figure 8) for the Buffer Point List that "must exist in contiguous physical memory." (Roach, Column 8, Lines 31-35). In other words, Roach is wholly unrelated to inserting an STag value in a first field of a DDP or RDMA header and validating the STag value in the first field with a bit flag or other specified value in the second field of the DDP or RDMA header as alleged in the Office Action, and instead is related to buffer lists stored in physical memory.

Because the combination of references clearly fail to teach "initiating an RDMA write operation using a one-shot initiation process between a driver and a NIC of a host, wherein the one-shot initiation process comprises communicating a single command message comprising: buffer command information comprising commands to insert and validate an STag value, and a write command to write an RDMA send message; inserting the STag value in a first field of a DDP or RDMA header of the RDMA send message; and validating the STag value in the first field with a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the DDP or RDMA header," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 24, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Osborne, Roach and Tillier (Claims 12-15)

On pages 14-16 of the Office Action, claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborne in view of Roach and further in view of Tillier (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,742). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons. Claims 12-15 depend either directly or indirectly from Applicant's independent claim 1. Applicant believes that claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination of references, in that Tillier fails to overcome the deficiencies of Osborne in view of Roach, for at least the reasons set forth above. Because claims 12-15 depend from independent

claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-15 are allowable over the proposed combination of Osborne, Roach and Tillier, as well. The Applicant further submits that each of claims 12-15 is independently allowable. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Osborne and Pandya (Claim 17)

On pages 16-18 of the Office Action, independent claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborne in view of Pandya (U.S. Patent No. 7,376,755). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding Applicant's independent claim 17, the combination of Osborne and Pandya at least fail to disclose, for example, "wherein a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation is performed between the driver and the NIC of the host, the one-shot completion process comprising communicating a single completion message comprising: a send complete indication, and buffer freeing status information," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 17.

The Office Action alleges that Osborne's disclosure of a receive command 77 sent between an application 78 and an operating system 72 in a receiver discloses a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation being performed between the driver and the NIC of the host. (Office Action, Pages 17-18). However, the Applicant notes that a receive command sent **between an application 78 and an operating system 72** in a receiver is clearly different than **a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation** being performed **between the driver and the NIC of the host**. In fact, as is known in the art, RDMA completion processes (i.e., complete indication and buffer freeing status information) occur in the transmitting node (*see e.g.*, Applicant's Prior Art Figure 3, 420-460), not in the receiving node as alleged in the Office Action with regard to Osborne. Further, as is well known in the art, RDMA operations do

not involve copying message data from application memory 66 to operating system buffers 62 as taught by Osborne. Thus, the Applicant notes that Osborne is wholly unrelated to a completion process of an RDMA operation, let alone "wherein a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation is performed between the driver and the NIC of the host, the one-shot completion process comprising communicating a single completion message comprising: a send complete indication, and buffer freeing status information," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 17.

Pandya fails to remedy the deficiencies of Osborne. The Office Action alleges that Pandya's disclosure of Figure 33 (element 3310) and at Column 13, Lines 35-48 teach the Applicant's claim limitations. However, the Applicant notes that Pandya's Figure 33 is completely unrelated to an RDMA operation. Rather, Pandya's RDMA teachings are in reference to Figures 35-38. Further, the Applicant notes that Pandya's reference of "Send Status & Sense" 3310 merely illustrates a message sent from a target to an initiator and is not a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation being performed between the driver and the NIC of the host. Additionally, the Applicant notes that Pandya's specification fails to even mention steps 3310-3312 in Figure 33, let alone describe the process being performed. With regard to Pandya's disclosure at Column 13, Lines 35-48, the Applicant notes first that the disclosure is unrelated to Pandya's Figure 33 and instead refers to Pandya's Figure 11. Also, the Applicant notes that nowhere in the cited section of Pandya or elsewhere does Pandya remedy the deficiencies of Osborne. Specifically, although Pandya generally refers to releasing buffers being used for data transfers, nowhere in Pandya is there any disclosure regarding a single completion message comprising a send complete indication and buffer freeing status information, for example. Thus, Pandya also fails to teach "wherein **a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation** is performed **between the driver and the NIC of the host**, the one-shot completion process comprising communicating **a single completion message comprising: a send complete indication, and buffer freeing status information**," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 17.

Because the combination of references clearly fail to teach "wherein **a one-shot**

completion process of an RDMA operation is performed **between the driver and the NIC of the host**, the one-shot completion process comprising communicating **a single completion message comprising: a send complete indication, and buffer freeing status information**," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 17, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Osborne, Pandya and Tillier (Claims 18, 20 and 22-23)

On pages 18-20 of the Office Action, claims 18, 20 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pandya in view of Pandya and further in view of Tillier. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons. Claims 18, 20 and 22-23 depend either directly or indirectly from Applicant's independent claim 17. Applicant believes that claim 17 is allowable over the proposed combination of references, in that Tillier fails to overcome the deficiencies of Osborne in view of Pandya, for at least the reasons set forth above. Because claims 18, 20 and 22-23 depend from independent claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18, 20 and 22-23 are allowable over the proposed combination of Osborne, Pandya and Tillier, as well. The Applicant further submits that each of claims 18, 20 and 22-23 is independently allowable. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 18, 20 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Osborne, Pandya, Tillier and Roach (Claim 19)

On pages 20-21 of the Office Action, claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborne in view of Pandya, in further view of Tillier and still further in view of Roach. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons. Claim 19 depends either directly or indirectly from Applicant's independent claim 17.

Applicant believes that claim 17 is allowable over the proposed combination of references, in that Tillier and Roach fails to overcome the deficiencies of Osborne and Pandya, for at least the reasons set forth above. Because claim 19 depends from independent claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is allowable over the proposed combination of Osborne, Pandya, Tillier and Roach, as well. The Applicant further submits that claim 19 is independently allowable. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Osborne, Pandya, Tillier and Futral (Claim 21)

On pages 22-23 of the Office Action, claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborne in view of Pandya, in further view of Tillier and still further in view of Futral et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,797, hereinafter "Futral"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons. Claim 21 depends from independent claim 17. Applicant believes that claim 17 is allowable over the proposed combination of references, in that Tillier and Futral fails to overcome the deficiencies of Osborne and Pandya, for at least the reasons set forth above. Because claim 21 depends from independent claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is allowable over the proposed combination of Osborne, Pandya, Tillier and Futral, as well. The Applicant further submits that claim 21 is independently allowable. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Osborne, Pandya and Roach (Claim 25)

On pages 23-27 of the Office Action, independent claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborne in view of Pandya and further in view of Roach. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding Applicant's independent claim 25, the combination of Osborne, Pandya and Roach at least fail to disclose, for example, "completing an RDMA write operation using a one-shot completion process between a NIC and a driver of a host, wherein the one-shot completion process comprises communicating a single completion message comprising: a send complete indication, buffer freeing status information, and an STag value; receiving the single completion message; identifying the STag value in a first field of a header of the single completion message; and validating the STag value in the first field of the header by identifying a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the header," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 25.

As discussed above with regard to Applicant's independent claim 17, nowhere in Osborne is there any disclosure regarding completing an RDMA write operation using a one-shot completion process between a driver and a NIC of a host. Specifically, the Office Action's citation to sections of Osborne that merely disclose a receive command 77 sent **between an application 78 and an operating system 72** in a receiver is clearly different than **a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation** being performed **between the driver and the NIC of the host**. In fact, as is known in the art, RDMA completion processes (i.e., complete indication and buffer freeing status information) occur in the transmitting node (*see e.g.*, Applicant's Prior Art Figure 3, 420-460), not in the receiving node as alleged in the Office Action with regard to Osborne. Further, as is well known in the art, RDMA operations do not involve copying message data from application memory 66 to operating system buffers 62 as taught by Osborne. Thus, the Applicant notes that Osborne is wholly unrelated to a completion process of an RDMA operation.

Pandya fails to remedy the deficiencies of Osborne. The Office Action alleges that Pandya's disclosure of Figure 33 (element 3310) and at Column 13, Lines 35-48 teach the Applicant's claim limitations. (Office Action, Page 25). However, the Applicant notes that Pandya's Figure 33 is completely unrelated to an RDMA operation. Rather, Pandya's RDMA teachings are in reference to Figures 35-38. Further, the Applicant notes that Pandya's reference of "Send Status & Sense" 3310 merely illustrates a message sent from a target to an initiator and is not a one-shot completion process of an RDMA operation being performed between the driver

and the NIC of the host. Additionally, the Applicant notes that Pandya's specification fails to even mention steps 3310-3312 in Figure 33, let alone describe the process being performed. With regard to Pandya's disclosure at Column 13, Lines 35-48, the Applicant notes first that the disclosure is unrelated to Pandya's Figure 33 and instead refers to Pandya's Figure 11. Also, the Applicant notes that nowhere in the cited section of Pandya or elsewhere does Pandya remedy the deficiencies of Osborne. Specifically, although Pandya generally refers to releasing buffers being used for data transfers, nowhere in Pandya is there any disclosure regarding a single completion message comprising a send complete indication, buffer freeing status information and an Stage value, for example.

Roach fails to remedy the deficiencies of Osborne and Pandya. Rather, Roach merely teaches placing information indicating which frame is the last frame in a series of frames being sent. (*See e.g.*, Roach, Abstract).

Also, the Office Action alleges that Roach's Figures 8-9 remedy the deficiencies of Osborne and Pandya by teaching a one-shot completion process comprises communicating a single command message comprising an STag value. (Office Action, Pages 26-27). However, Roach's Figures 8-9 merely describe a Buffer Point List Format (Figure 9) and the Buffer Pointer List Entry Format (Figure 8) for the Buffer Point List that "must exist in contiguous physical memory." (Roach, Column 8, Lines 31-35). In other words, Roach is wholly unrelated to **a one-shot completion process** comprises **communicating a single command message** comprising **an STag value** as alleged in the Office Action, and instead is related to buffer lists stored in physical memory.

Additionally, the Office Action alleges that Roach's Figures 8-9 remedy the deficiencies of Osborne by teaching "identifying the STag value in a first field of a header of the single completion message; and validating the STag value in the first field of the header by identifying a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the header." (Office Action, Pages 26-27). However, as mentioned above, Roach's Figures 8-9 merely describe a Buffer Point List Format (Figure 9) and the Buffer Pointer List Entry Format (Figure 8) for the Buffer Point List that "must exist in contiguous physical memory." (Roach, Column 8, Lines 31-35). In other words,

Roach is wholly unrelated to identifying an STag value in a first field of a header and validating the STag value in the first field of the header by identifying a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the header as alleged in the Office Action, and instead is related to buffer lists stored in physical memory.

Because the combination of references clearly fail to teach "completing an RDMA write operation using a one-shot completion process between a NIC and a driver of a host, wherein the one-shot completion process comprises communicating a single completion message comprising: a send complete indication, buffer freeing status information, and an STag value; receiving the single completion message; identifying the STag value in a first field of a header of the single completion message; and validating the STag value in the first field of the header by identifying a bit flag or other specified value in a second field of the header," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 25, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Response to Arguments Section

The Response to Arguments section of the Office Action addresses the Applicant's previous arguments to rejections no longer pending in the Application. The Applicant respectfully notes that the Applicant will not address those Response to Arguments related to rejections no longer pending; however, the Applicant reserves the right to argue additional reasons supporting the allowability of claims 1-25 should the need arise in the future.

Final Matters

The Office Action makes various statements regarding former claims 1-25, 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Osborne reference, the Roach reference, the Tillier reference, the Pandya reference, the Futral reference, one of ordinary skill in the art, etc. that are now moot in

view of the previously presented amendments and/or arguments. Thus, the Applicants will not address all of such statements at the present time. However, the Applicants expressly reserve the right to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (e.g., if such statements should become relevant by appearing in a rejection of any current or future claim).

Applicant reserves the right to argue additional reasons supporting the allowability of claims 1-25 should the need arise in the future.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance, and requests that the application be passed to issue.

Should anything remain in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any required fees not paid herewith or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Date: February 12, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip Henry Sheridan/
Philip Henry Sheridan
Reg. No. 59,918
Attorney for Applicant

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(T) 312 775 8000
(F) 312 775 8100